## State of Michigan

John Engler, Governor

## **Department of Environmental Quality**



Russell J. Harding, Director

INTERNET: http://www.deq.state.mi.us

# Drinking Water Revolving Fund (DWRF) Final Intended Use Plan Fiscal Year 2002

Prepared by: Municipal Facilities Section, Environmental Assistance Division and Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division November 1, 2001

The Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) will not discriminate against any individual or group on the basis of race, sex, religion, age, national origin, color, marital status, disability or political beliefs. Questions or concerns should be directed to the DEQ Office of Personnel Services, P.O. Box 30473, Lansing, MI 48909.

DWRF DWRF DWRF DWRF DWRF

### **Table of Contents**

I.	Introduction	3
II.	Structure of the Drinking Water Revolving Fund	4
III.	Advantages of the Drinking Water Revolving Fund	6
IV.	Long Term Goals	6
V.	Short Term Goals	7
VI.	Allocation of Funds	8
VII.	Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds - Set Asides	9
VIII.	Criteria and Method for Distribution of Funds - Project Loans	11
IX.	Disadvantaged Community Status	12
X.	EPA Automated Clearinghouse Activities	13
XI.	Assurances	13
XII.	Public Review and Comment	14
XIII.	Origination of Documents	14

Fiscal Year 2002 Project Priority List and Point Assignment Sheet

#### I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>

Program details of Michigan's Drinking Water Revolving Fund (DWRF) are set forth in 1994 PA 451, the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Part 54, Safe Drinking Water Assistance, MCL 324.5401-324.5421.

The Michigan Department Of Environmental Quality (DEQ), through the Environmental Assistance and Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Divisions, administers the DWRF. In addition, the Michigan Municipal Bond Authority (The Authority) is charged with administering DWRF funds through 1985 PA 227, as amended, known as the Shared Credit Rating Act.

The DWRF provides reduced interest rate loan financing to qualified water suppliers to finance construction of their waterworks system projects. Projects may include new wells, new water treatment plants, storage facilities, upgrades or expansions to existing facilities, transmission lines, pumping facilities, and other related waterworks system improvements. Suppliers must meet federal and state program requirements, as well as demonstrate their ability to publicly finance their project and retire project debt.

The DWRF is a state-managed program. This Intended Use Plan (IUP) describes how the DEQ and the Authority will jointly administer the DWRF during Fiscal Year (FY) 2002. The Municipal Facilities Section (MFS) of the Environmental Assistance Division (EAD) is charged with carrying out the program administration responsibilities. The Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division (DWRPD) will assess project priority, issue the necessary construction permits, and offer technical review/assistance throughout project planning, design, and construction. Financial administration of the program will be handled by the staff of the Authority.

The administrative contacts for the DWRF are:

Mr. Chip Heckathorn, Chief Municipal Facilities Section Environmental Assistance Division Department of Environmental Quality PO Box 30457 Lansing, MI 48909-7957 Voice: 517-373-4725

Fax: 517-335-0743

E-mail: heckathc@state.mi.us

Mr. James Cleland, Assistant Chief
Drinking Water and Radiological Protection Division
Department of Environmental Quality
PO Box 30195
Lansing, MI 48909

Voice: 517-335-8326 Fax: 517-335-8298

E-mail: clelandj@state.mi.us

Ms. Janet Hunter Moore, Executive Director Michigan Municipal Bond Authority Michigan Department of Treasury Treasury Building Lansing, MI 48922

Voice: 517-373-1728 Fax: 517-335-2160

E-mail: treasmmba@state.mi.us

Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region 5 staff will offer guidance and conduct annual program oversight reviews of the DWRF. The EPA serves as a helpful partner in creating and maintaining this program.

The relationship between the DEQ, the Authority, and the EPA is established in an Operating Agreement signed by authorized signatories from each agency. The Operating Agreement is incorporated into this IUP by reference and is available from the DEQ upon request.

This IUP includes detail on specific project funding and identifies amounts to be set aside from federal capitalization grants for other uses authorized under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) and Part 54. A Public Hearing for the draft IUP and the draft Project Priority List (PPL) was held on August 28, 2001 at 1:30 p.m. in Lansing, Michigan.

The DEQ certifies that it is recognized by the EPA as the primacy agency for management of the drinking water program. The priority system was developed and will be carried out each fiscal year by staff of the DEQ. The priority system is designed to provide assistance to those projects that will have the greatest impact in facilitating safe drinking water supplies.

#### II. STRUCTURE OF THE DWRF

The financing structure of the DWRF is similar to the State Revolving Fund (SRF). For water suppliers who are municipalities with bonding authority, this presents no significant challenges. The DWRF will sell tax-exempt revenue bonds to provide money that will be used to reimburse communities for incurred project costs. As the DWRF reimburses suppliers, federal funds from the capitalization grant will be transferred into a debt service reserve account to provide coverage for the leveraged bond issue. State match funds are also deposited into the debt service reserve account. As the DWRF project construction progresses, project funds will be disbursed to the supplier from the bonds sold.

However, for borrowers who are non-municipal entities, limitations on private activity for tax-exempt issues will require the DEQ and the Authority to fund private water suppliers from funds other than tax-exempt revenue bonds. These loans will be made as direct loans with a letter of credit supplied by the private borrower or through a partnership with a private lending institution with the State providing an insurance annuity. There are no private water suppliers on the FY2002 PPL.

There will be a provision for subordinate investment of funds between the DWRF and the SRF. This concept permits the administrators of the two funds to make temporary investments from one fund or the other in the event that moneys are needed to service

debt on the state's tax exempt bond issues, cover deficiencies in a fund's reserve accounts, or satisfy other reserve account requirements. Only those funds periodically released from debt service reserve accounts, supplemental reserve accounts, revenue accounts, or any other account of the fund wherein released moneys may be generated, may be used for the purposes of subordinate investment.

At each point that moneys are released, the DEQ and the Authority will undertake a "snapshot" look at both the SRF and the DWRF. For each fund, we will first examine whether we need to service debt or satisfy reserve account requirements within the fund from which the released moneys originated. Next, we will examine the other fund for the same conditions. Then, if sufficient moneys are available to satisfy requirements for each fund, the released money will pass completely through and become available for future commitments to new projects consistent with its source.

Set-asides in the DWRF are derived from the overall capitalization grant awarded to the state by the EPA. They are designated for specified uses within the DWRF to address areas of concern included in the reauthorization of the SDWA.

Legal provisions included in 1985 PA 227 permit the Authority to establish accounts and sub-accounts within the DWRF to track revenues and expenditures for the set-asides. The set-asides for program and other activities will be directly administered by the DWRPD. Staff of the DWRPD will also be responsible for the technical assistance activities, except for those funds made available to subsidize loans to disadvantaged communities. The disadvantaged community loans will be managed by the MFS.

The following is a list of potential set-asides identified in Section 1452 of the federal SDWA.

#### **DWRF Administration - 4 percent**

#### **Technical Assistance - 2 percent**

#### Program Set-asides - 10 percent

- Public Water System Supervision
- Source Water Protection
- Capacity Development
- Operator Certification

#### Other Activities - 15 percent, not to exceed 10 percent for any one activity

- Loans for Source Water Protection
- Assistance for Capacity Development
- Implement Wellhead Protection

It is imperative to note that the Program Set-asides require a one-for-one state match, in addition to the regular 20 percent state match calculated on the entire amount of the federal capitalization grant. Thus, money diverted to these set-asides will demand a heavier investment of state or local funds.

#### III. ADVANTAGES OF THE DWRF

The primary advantage for Michigan water suppliers is the ability to borrow funds at rates below market. The DWRF interest rate is established prior to each new fiscal year. As identified in Part 54, 1994 PA 451, determination of the interest rates is based on demand, market conditions, program costs, and future needs.

In setting the interest rates for FY2002, the department examined the 20-year Bond Buyer Index for general obligation municipal bonds to identify current market conditions existing at the time the draft IUP was prepared. Then, to establish a rate of interest for municipal borrowers, the DEQ considered present and future demand for DWRF assistance and the cost of compliance.

Once the rate is determined for municipal borrowers, the resulting interest subsidy to municipalities would be used for private borrowers. If a private borrower chose to obtain a letter of credit and receives a direct DWRF loan from the Authority, the interest rate would be determined by using the T-bill rate as the base and applying an identical percentage reduction of interest as municipalities receive. For those private borrowers who chose to obtain financing through a financial institution, the interest rate would be the lending institution's rate charges, reduced by an identical percentage reduction as a municipality would receive.

The interest rate for municipal borrowers in FY2002 will be 2.5 percent, as established by the DEQ Director. There are no private borrowers on the FY2002 Project Priority List.

Apart from the low interest rate, suppliers also benefit from the DWRF in that they can finance all eligible waterworks system costs. The major benefit results from the fact that water supply financing in the past has always been left to the local units of government or private entities. Historically, there has been no significant state financial assistance available to local officials in meeting water supply needs. The DWRF provides an ongoing source of funding to maintain or improve drinking water quality and public health.

#### IV. LONG-TERM GOALS

Michigan's DWRF establishes a funding source designed to protect and preserve public health within the state's boundaries. Michigan's geographical identity as a "Great Lakes" state affords its citizens with an abundant and high quality water resource from which to draw its drinking water. Unlike many states, Michigan water supplies are plentiful and periods of restricted use are few in most communities.

Given our abundant water resource, the greater challenge for water suppliers lies in protecting the high quality of the resource, as well as ensuring that adequate volume and pressure exist to deliver potable water to the customer.

Given the limitations on pooled capital, the DEQ will work toward establishing tighter integration of the federal/state/local partnership. The DEQ continues to examine ways to work together with various federal and state agencies, such as Rural Development and the Michigan Economic Development Corporation, so that we may collectively fund qualifying projects and maximize use of our capital pool to achieve our stated goals.

Such partnerships will ultimately benefit everyone. Industry, tourism, and day-to-day quality of life are strengthened when our most valuable natural asset is preserved and made available for our use and enjoyment. To this end, Michigan's DWRF seeks the following:

- A. To maintain statewide compliance with all applicable state and federal drinking water laws, rules, and standards.
- B. To protect the public health and environmental quality of our state.
- C. To implement source water assessment, wellhead protection, and source water protection programs.
- D. To develop strategies within the DWRF to assist smaller, economically disadvantaged communities in meeting drinking water standards.
- E. To promote the DWRF as a viable tool for use by Michigan water suppliers in financing their waterworks system improvements or upgrades.
- F. To secure Michigan's full share of federal funding and to expeditiously obligate these moneys, along with the state contributions, for the construction of eligible facilities which meet state and federal requirements.
- G. To develop effective partnerships with other federal and state financing sources to promote efficiency in environmental review procedures and coordination of funding.
- H. To apply a capacity assessment program for all new community and nontransient noncommunity water supplies, and to apply a strategy to existing systems.

#### V. SHORT-TERM GOALS

In order to accomplish the long-term goals, we must also focus on more immediate objectives. Therefore, our short-term goals in FY2002 are:

- A. To continue our outreach effort to publicize the DWRF through direct mail, electronic media, newsletter publication, and meetings.
- B. To continue implementation plans for source water protection focused on statewide surface water assessments and groundwater assessments in areas tributary to the Great Lakes.
- C. To enhance the state's wellhead protection program through the implementation of a matching grant program.
- D. To implement a technical assistance program for small communities.
- E. To fund projects identified on the PPL, enabling them to proceed during FY2002 with construction of facilities included in their adopted project plans.
- F. To invite stakeholder participation in the development of administrative rules for conducting capacity assessments of certain public water supplies.

#### VI. <u>ALLOCATION OF FUNDS</u>

With Michigan's decision to utilize a leveraged DWRF bond program, the establishment of a fundable range for any given fiscal year entails a series of steps that culminate in a determination of how much leveraged borrowing fund resources can support. Using a series of interest rate assumptions (DWRF loan rate, return on investment rates, and revenue bond rate) this process for FY 2002 is outlined below:

1. The DEQ reviewed the total amount of loans committed through September 30, 2001, and other draw amounts that affect the revolving fund.

to service loan awards through FY 2001	\$ 5,648,900
Additional revenue bond amount needed	
Less total revenue bonds issued to date	( <u>\$151,060,000)</u>
Less direct loan draws to date	(\$ 1,064,903)
Less reduction in loans for admin. complete projects	(\$ 1,191,197)
Plus FY 2001 loan awards through 9/30/01	\$ 26,710,000
Total loan commitments through 9/30/00	\$132,255,000

- 2. To establish an estimate of reserve fund capabilities, the DEQ assumed that the capitalization grant and the state match would remain constant for the next five years (for planning purposes only). Using the current administration budget recommendation of \$823 million, and Michigan's new allotment of 4.1 percent, approximately \$33.7 million in capitalization funds from the EPA would be available for FY 2002. After the subtraction of set asides and the addition of the required 20 percent state match, this would provide approximately \$35.8 million for the DWRF reserve deposit.
- 3. The DEQ then looked at how much the DWRF could support in loan commitments using a five-year forecast. By assuming the federal appropriation and state match amounts remain constant, the DEQ can leverage approximately \$89 million each year for five years.
- 4. Since the \$89 million capacity must also service existing loan commitments for projects with active construction, the amount calculated in Step 1 above must be subtracted.

\$439,351,100/5years = \$87,870,220 available as fundable range

The DWRF could support \$87.9 million in loan commitments for FY 2002. Since the total amount of projects ready to receive DWRF loans in FY 2002 is estimated at \$73.9 million (amount taken from the Project Priority List), the DWRF fundable range should extend though the entire priority list in FY 2002.

The governor of each state may, at his or her discretion, transfer 33 percent of available moneys between the SRF and the DWRF programs. This may occur starting one year after a state receives its first capitalization grant for project funds. At this time, there is not a proposal to directly transfer moneys between the programs.

#### VII. CRITERIA AND METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS - SET-ASIDES

The DEQ has established the set-aside percentages/amounts based on what it can utilize within the fiscal year. The split of moneys is structured to meet not only expected needs (e.g. 4 percent for administration), but also to target programs that can help suppliers prepare themselves to qualify for DWRF loans (technical assistance funds used to defray planning loans).

#### **Source Water Assessment**

The Source Water Assessment set-aside was only available from the FY1997 federal appropriation. Since expenditures are allowed from this set-aside over several years, the DEQ work plans include expenditures for source water assessment during FY2002, but these efforts will not consume funds from the FY2002 capitalization grant.

Work is well underway on source water assessments. The state submitted the program for approval by the EPA in accordance with the February 1999 deadline. Each local health department is contracting for fieldwork, and Michigan State University and the Groundwater Education In Michigan centers are under contract at this time. The DEQ also has contracts with the U.S. Geological Survey and an agreement with the city of Detroit to perform source water assessments for the surface waters of Southeast Michigan.

The Michigan Source Water Assessment Program will have to address over 10,000 non-community public water supplies in addition to the estimated 1,500 community public water supplies. Thus, the program must be specific to Michigan's needs, establishing priorities for the work to achieve completion within the permitted time while making use of available resources.

#### **Proposed Set-Asides from the FY2002 Appropriation**

#### Administration

Up to 4 percent of the federal capitalization grant can be used to administer the fund. Michigan intends to utilize/bank the full 4 percent, which for FY2002 is estimated at \$1,619,664. Any funds not utilized in FY2002 will be retained on account for administration in future years.

#### **Technical Assistance**

The 2 percent Technical Assistance set-aside from FY2002 federal funds amounts to \$809,832. The DEQ has a contract with a technical service provider for various types of technical assistance to public water suppliers serving a population less than 10,000. The contract began in FY1999 and continues through FY2002. The technical assistance will include operator training, direct on-site technical assistance for system operation at community and non-community water supplies, and assistance with documents,

community plans, and procedures to apply for DWRF assistance. The annual contract amount is \$208,000.

The DEQ will also use technical assistance set-aside funds to the extent funds are available, to pay for project planning costs for disadvantaged communities with less than 10,000 people who apply for DWRF assistance. The projected amount available is \$601,832.

The administration and technical assistance set-asides taken from previous capitalization grants will be combined with FY2002 set-aside funds for reimbursements expected in FY2002.

#### Program Set-Asides - \$1,175,000

The DEQ intends continue three programs in FY2002 using three program set-asides. The additional required matching funds will be provided through the Public Water Supply Supervision Program from state General Fund and Restricted Fund (Fee) revenue. Following is a breakdown of the \$1,175,000 projected amount:

**Capacity Development** - State staff, augmented by contracts for professional services, will be used to implement the program based upon EPA final guidance.

The Michigan Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1998 provide authorization to conduct the program. The amendments allow the department to apply capacity assessment criteria to new community and nontransient noncommunity public water supplies and to selected existing systems under a state strategy. The state also applies capacity development requirements to DWRF applicants.

The department developed program guidance in FY2000 for statewide application in FY2000 using stakeholders for public participation. Professional services were particularly valuable in areas where staff lacked expertise, such as financial capacity analyses. The projected amount to be expended is \$450,000.

**Source Water Protection** – We are implementing an abandoned well management program approved by the DEQ in 1998. We completed three contracts for demonstration projects in past years. The demonstration projects focused on abandoned wells in approved wellhead protection areas.

We also began administration of a statewide abandoned well matching grant program in FY2001, following adoption of administrative rules. The state funds are available from the recent bond issue establishing the Clean Michigan Initiative. The total project amount for this activity is \$225,000.

**Operator Certification** - The EAD will administer the program through expansion and improvement to the existing waterworks operator certification program.

EPA has published the operator certification program guidance. Based upon the guidance, the DEQ has estimated the costs to expand the program. Operator training is also included with this program.

We received approval of 3.0 additional FTEs in FY1999 to administer the program at an estimated annual cost of \$225,000. The remaining funds (\$275,000) will be used for top priority activities in the program, which may include limited-term staff; a new computer system for record keeping and compliance tracking; and new testing requirements and procedures for noncommunity operators and community systems which received a waiver in the past. We initiated the purchase of exam materials and grading services through third-party vendors in FY1999. The projected amount for these program elements is \$500,000.

#### Wellhead Protection (Section 1452(k)) - \$1,000,000

The DEQ has authorization under the Michigan Safe Drinking Water Act Amendments of 1998 to implement a wellhead protection matching grant program to enhance the existing voluntary state program. The DEQ hired two staff in FY1998 to administer the program. Administrative rules have been passed using a stakeholder process.

In April 1999, grants were awarded to 54 communities totaling slightly over \$1 million. Contracts are signed and work is underway. Grants were awarded to an additional 62 communities in August 1999 totaling \$1.1 million. Grants were awarded to 66 communities in 2000, totaling approximately \$1 million.

The grant funds are matched 100 percent by public water supplies. Thus, 50 percent of costs will be funded by the grant, while the local supplier provides 50 percent from its own resources. The program emphasis is scientific delineation of wellhead protection areas and obtaining state approval for complete wellhead protection programs. Implementation activities are also eligible, but are a lower priority.

The money will be used for educational materials and training, program staff, and wellhead protection grants. The projected total amount to be used is \$1 million.

#### VIII. CRITERIA AND METHOD FOR DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS - PROJECT LOANS

Michigan's DWRF will commit loans for qualified projects on the basis of project plans that were submitted to the MFS by May 1. Plans were reviewed by staff of the DEQ to ensure compliance with Section 5405, 1994 PA 451, before being placed on the PPL for FY2002.

The DWRF must, to the maximum extent practicable, give priority to projects that:

- address the most serious risks to human health
- are necessary to ensure compliance with the requirements of the federal Safe Drinking Water Act
- assist systems most in need according to the state's affordability requirements

Michigan's priority system takes these factors into account in the assignment of priority points. Acute violations receive a larger number of points than any other category. In fact, standards compliance offers over 41 percent of a project's total possible points. All factors point to the need for the project to comply with federal drinking water requirements, and affordability is addressed by the award of additional points for disadvantaged community status and in the ultimate tiebreaker. Michigan's priority system is detailed in section 5406, 1994 PA 451.

Twenty-seven projects totaling \$106.7 million are included on the FY2002 PPL. This includes seven projects and/or segments equaling \$33.3 million that will be considered for funding in the future.

The FY2002 PPL is included as part of the IUP process, and was presented as part of the public hearing.

Section 1452(a)(2) of the federal Safe Drinking Water Act requires the state to first make available 15 percent of all funds annually credited to the DWRF for financial assistance to water suppliers serving fewer than 10,000 persons. For FY2002, Michigan must reach or exceed \$6,073,800 to satisfy this requirement.

All projects are reviewed and scored based upon the priority system outlined in Part 54. Funds are made available for commitment based on the priority ranking and projects will only be funded out of order to satisfy requirements for small community assistance.

Employing the criteria found in section 5415, 1994 PA 451, the director of the DEQ has established the interest rates for FY2002 at 2.5 percent. The term of the loan will run up to 20 years for most projects. Those suppliers meeting disadvantaged criteria will, however, be able to extend their terms for up to 30 years, if they desire.

Part 54, 1994 PA 451, also permits suppliers serving less than 10,000 persons to receive reimbursement of project planning costs upon delivery of an approvable project plan to the DEQ. Legislation has been passed to provide a funding mechanism for this reimbursement. The program began providing interim loans in FY2001.

#### IX. DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY STATUS

Disadvantaged community status is determined by the DEQ based on information submitted with a supplier's project plan. To qualify, an applicant must first meet the definition of "municipality" found in Part 54. Next, the updated median annual household income (MAHI) of the area to be served must be less than 120 percent of the state's updated MAHI. Finally, the costs of the project must be borne by the customers in the service area. If costs are spread over a larger area, then that area must demonstrate that it meets the poverty or affordability criteria.

Once these conditions are met, a community will be afforded the disadvantaged community status if one of the following is true:

- More than 50 percent of the area to be served by the proposed project is identified as a poverty area by the U.S. Bureau of the Census.
- The updated MAHI of the area to be served is less than the most recently published federal poverty guidelines for a family of four in the contiguous United States.
- The updated MAHI is less than the updated statewide MAHI and the annual user costs for water supply exceed 1.5 percent of the service area's MAHI.

• The updated MAHI is more than the updated statewide MAHI and the annual user costs for water supply exceed 3 percent of the service area's MAHI.

The major benefits for qualified communities include 50 additional priority points, extension of loan terms to 30 years, and assistance to help defray the costs of preparing project plans.

A complete discussion of the disadvantaged community status may be found in a guidance document prepared by the department to more fully explain how a supplier can achieve the status and benefit by it.

#### X. <u>EPA AUTOMATED CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES</u>

The EPA employs an Automated Clearinghouse (ACH) to make disbursements of federal funds to the DWRF. Michigan will comply with this system and deposit funds drawn from it into appropriate accounts set up for the DWRF.

In FY2002, Michigan anticipates drawing capitalization grant funds from the ACH according to the following schedule:

1st Quarter - \$ 2,000,000 2nd Quarter - \$ 2,000,000 3rd Quarter - \$10,000,000 4th Quarter - \$11,421,900

As project costs (or program administrative/set-aside costs) are incurred, one request for disbursement may be submitted by the local project's authorized representative (or state agencies) each month. The request for disbursement of funds will be sent directly to the DEQ, who will then process the request as part of a weekly draw request. Upon delivery to its office, the Authority will execute the fund drawdown electronically by transferring money from the federal ACH and state accounts.

Moneys will be automatically deposited into the debt service reserve account of the DWRF, while funds are electronically wired to a municipal water supplier's bank from a DWRF account that holds funds from a taxable state issue. For non-municipal water suppliers, the funds will be transferred from direct federal and state capitalization amounts established specifically for the purpose of reimbursing their eligible project costs.

#### XI. ASSURANCES

The final guidelines from the EPA set forth provisions that the state must provide certain assurances in order to qualify for capitalization grant funding. Such assurances are incorporated into the Operating Agreement and are included here by reference.

#### XII. PUBLIC REVIEW AND COMMENT

In order to satisfy public participation requirements, the DEQ held a public hearing to discuss the IUP on August 28, 2001 at 1:30 p.m. The location was Conference Room B in the Environmental Assistance Division, Second Floor Town Center, 333 S. Capitol Avenue, Lansing, Michigan. This hearing was publicly noticed in the Detroit Legal News, the Lansing State Journal, and the Marquette Mining Journal; posted on the DEQ calendar of events; mailed to all persons and engineering firms on our newsletter mailing list, and individually noticed to each water supplier on the draft FY2002 PPL. These sources promote the hearing to ensure maximum public input from those interested in the DWRF. The hearing affords stakeholders and other interested parties an opportunity to hear and comment on how the DEQ plans to disburse the DWRF loan moneys. All comments were responded to upon the close of the hearing record.

Questions about the IUP may be directed to:

Mr. Chip Heckathorn, Chief
Municipal Facilities Section
Environmental Assistance Division
Department of Environmental Quality
PO Box 30457
Lansing, MI 48909
517-373-4725
Fax: 517-335-0743

#### XIII. ORIGINATION OF DOCUMENTS

The Chief of the Environmental Assistance Division, Department of Environmental Quality is responsible for issuing the IUP. The IUP and its accompanying information are prepared by the MFS. It is a collaborative effort of DWRPD and EAD/MFS staff that provide data for its development.

#### MUNICIPAL FACILITIES - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION DRINKING WATER RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION DIVISION

## MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



TOWN CENTER 2ND FLOOR, P.O. BOX 30457, LANSING, MI 48909-7957 (PHONE: 517-373-2161)

_	•	Vater Revolving Fund 1002 Project Priority List	Bv Rank-Proje	ct Information	Date Printed: 1	0/24/2001 2:0	00:09 P	Page 1 of 1
Rank	Proj No.	Project Name and De		or information	Population	Total Points	Bind. Comm. Date.	Bind. Comm. Amt.
PROJECT	S WITH PRIOF	R YEAR SEGMENTS						
1	7079-02	Muir	Ionia Co	New wells, elev strg tank, repl mains; Seg 2	748	520	11/29/2001	\$340,000
2	7084-02	Chelsea	Chelsea	Seg 2; Repl mains, looping	3,900	480	03/12/2002	\$2,790,000
3	7019-04	Flint	Genesee Co	Seg 4; Completion of WTP upgrd/expnd	138,450	400	09/05/2002	\$19,930,000
PROJECTS	WITHOUT PR	IOR YEAR FUNDED SEGME	ENTS					
4	7027-01	Ontonagon	Ontonagon Co	New WTP, conn main, ext for consolidation	3,446	915	09/05/2002	\$6,700,000
5	7098-01	Adrian	Lenawee Co	WTP upgrd, repl mains, new wells.	22,276	740	06/11/2002	\$8,340,000
6	7108-01	Shelby	Oceana Co	Repl mains, looping, booster station, booster station rehab, new well	1,914	620	03/12/2002	\$940,000
7	7101-01	North Branch	Lapeer Co	New well, repl mains	1,027	595	06/11/2002	\$1,860,000
8	7106-01	Milford	Oakland Co	Phase 2: Looping, dist main, upgrd/repl stor tank	6,849	555	03/12/2002	\$2,470,000
9	7085-01	Jackson Co	Grass Lake	New WTP, new strg tank, repl mains	1,082	545	09/05/2002	\$2,435,000
10	7068-01	Marion	Osceola Co	Repl mains, dist ext, telemetry/power	819	530	06/11/2002	\$1,095,000
11	7111-01	YCUA	Washtenaw Co	Phase 1; 2nd DWSD supply connection	70,000	425	03/12/2002	\$4,040,000
12	7112-01	City of Ypsilanti	Washtenaw Co	Phase 2; 2nd DWSD supply connection	70,000	425	03/12/2002	\$1,010,000
13	7096-01	City of Ypsilanti	Washtenaw Co	Phase 3; Repl mains	70,000	425	03/12/2002	\$490,000
14	7102-01	Monroe County	South Rockwood	Repl mains, looping, 2nd DWSD supply connection	1,225	395	03/12/2002	\$1,415,000
15	7095-01	Parma	Jackson Co	Ext dist mains	907	360	09/05/2002	\$1,135,000
16	7010-03	Sault Ste Marie	Chippewa Co	Seg D & Seg E (partial) repl mains, looping	14,689	340	Future	\$8,210,000
16	7010-04	Sault Ste Marie	Chippewa Co	Segment C - Future	14,689	340	Future	\$5,920,000
17	7094-01	Clinton	Lenawee Co	New iron removal facility	2,475	320	03/12/2002	\$505,000
18	7009-01	Escanaba	Delta Co	WTP upgrd	13,659	315	06/11/2002	\$2,545,000
19	7034-01	Washtenaw Co	Saline	New iron fltr; injection well	7,866	305	Future	\$3,800,000
20	7020-01	Flint	Genesee Co	Repl mains; looping	138,450	300	Future	\$6,000,000
21	7110-01	Port Huron	St. Clair Co	Phase 3; Repl mains, looping	33.694	290	03/12/2002	\$3,640,000
22	7113-01	Port Huron	St. Clair Co	Phase 4; Repl mains, looping	33,694	290	06/11/2002	\$2,545,000
23	7088-01	Port Huron	St. Clair Co	Phase 2; Repl mains, looping	33.694	290	11/29/2001	\$8,640,000
24	7105-01	Port Huron	St. Clair Co	Future Phases; Repl mains; looping	33,694	290	Future	\$6,165,000
25	7081-01	Marysville	St Clair Co	Phase 1: WTP imps, stor upgrd	10,400	240	Future	\$1,500,000
26	7104-01	Marysville	St Clair Co	Phase 2 - WTP imps, repl mains	10,400	240	Future	\$2,220,000
27	Projects		31 3.4 33		Total Binding Co			\$106,680,000

Composition	MUNICIPAL FACILITIES SECTION - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DI DRINKING WATER RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION DIVISION TOWN CENTER 2ND FLOOR, P.O. BOX 30457, LANSING, MI 48909-7957 (PH		1)				ı	MICHIGA	AN DEI		MENT (								ık	DRINKI	IPAL FACILITIES SECTION - ENVIRONMENTAL ASSISTANCE DIVISI ING WATER RADIOLOGICAL PROTECTION DIVISION CENTER 2ND FLOOR, P.O. BOX 30457, LANSING, MI 48909-7957 (PHONE				
More	Michigan Drinking Water Revolving Fund																			Michia	an Drinking Water Revolving Fund				
Lean Assistance Ranking for Dirikhing Water Projects - Page 2 of 2  Section 1997  Sect	Key:		7010-02	7010-03	7019-03	7019-04	7023-02	7027-01	7068-01	7079-01	7081-01	084-02	7085-01 7088-01	7094-01	7095-01	7096-01	7100-01	7101-01	7102-01	Key:					
Property (Control of Control of C	Loan Assistance Ranking For Drinking Water Projects - Page 1 of 2		1 1																	Loan A	ssistance Ranking For Drinking Water Projects - Page 2 of 2			7106-01 7108-01 7110-01	
Mary		Points																				Points			
259																									
March of PM Standards (PM St	DRINKING WATER SYSTEM COMPLIANCE - TOTAL	450 (max)	150 1	50 15	0 175	175 150	0 375	425 175	150	150	150 17	5 175	5 150	175	175 1	150 450	175	350 150	0	DRINKING	WATER SYSTEM COMPLIANCE - TOTAL	450 (max)	150 150	150 150 150	
Fig. 1. 1999 to Market Cumpleme Market Compleme Market Complem	Acute Viol. of DW Standards, Health Advisory Levels, SWTT, Disease	250																		Acute Viol.	of DW Standards, Health Advisory Levels, SWTT, Disease	250			
Martine Congregation - 1	Non-Acute Viol. of DW Standards, Health Advisory Levels, SWTT, Disease	200																		Non-Acute	Viol. of DW Standards, Health Advisory Levels, SWTT, Disease	200			
## PRINTING	Facility Upgrade to Maintain Compliance	150					_				-									Facility Up	grade to Maintain Compliance	150			
Source Treatment of Conventing Manine   125 (max)   100	Aesthetic Upgrades to Maintain Compliance	25																		Aesthetic L	Upgrades to Maintain Compliance	25			
Met Mormun Capasity	INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS/UPGRADES - TOTAL		150 15	50 15															5	INFRASTR	RUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS/UPGRADES - TOTAL				
Patients   15	Source Treatment w/ Connecting Mains								_											Source Tre	-		25		
Other Ligopoles   25	Meet Minimum Capacity	_					_		_	_											Meet Minimum Capacity		$\vdash$		
Editorement Action  50   1	Reliability						-					_									Reliability		$\vdash$		
Some Water Protection    50	Other Upgrades												I								Other Upgrades				
Tagesman/Operations   125 (max)   15   125   125   125   120   1	Enforcement Action																				Enforcement Action				
Meet Meinraum Capacity	Source Water Protection		4																		Source Water Protection				
Reliability 75  Other Upgrades 25  Enformment Action 25  125 may 25 25 25 50 50 50 125 25 125 125 25 100 125 125 125 125 125 125 100 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125 125						10	0								_					Transmissi			100		
Cher Ligrandes								_					•				_			_					
Extracoment Action 25   25   25   25   25   25   25   25								_	▝										-		,				
Storage Facilities Pumping Stations										•						-		-		_	***		┢		
Meet Minimum Capacity			4																				-	400 400	
Reliability 75  Chier Upgrades 25  Selection 25  25  Selectio			25 2	25 25	5 50	50			25		25 2									Storage Fa	· ·		25		
Chier Upgrades		_	+	_	+	_	_			-			_		-	_	-	_	+				$\vdash$		
Enforcement Action 25			<b>-</b>			_	+	_	-	-					-				+		· · · · ·				
POPULATION-TOTAL  50 (max) 40 40 40 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50 50							_			-		•	-		-	_	-	_	+		***				
S0,000   S0			40	10 10			20	20 20	- 00	20	40 0	0 00	40	20	20	FO 40	20	20 20					40 40	20 20 40	
10,001-50,000			40 4	40 40				30 30	20	20	40 31	0 20	40	20			20	20 20	4	POPULATI			40 40	30 20 40	
3.301-10.000 30 20 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30							_				_						-		_						
S01-3.300   20		_			-	_				$\vdash$	_	_			-		-	_	-				╼╼		
0-500 10			+	_	+	_	-			-		•		_	_	_	-		. —				$\vdash$		
DISADVANTAGED COMMUNITY - TOTAL   S0 (max)   S0   S0   S0   S0   S0   S0   S0   S			-		+		-			-			-	-	-		-						$\vdash$	<del></del> -	
Granted   50								50	50				_			_	50		_				-		
CONSOLIDATION - TOTAL         100 (max)         60         60         60         40         CONSOLIDATION - TOTAL         100 (max)           Achieve Compliance         100         Image: Consolidation - TOTAL         Image: Consolidation - TOTAL         100 (max)         Image: Consolidation - TOTAL         Image: Consolidation - TOTAL			_																	DISADVAN		** ()			
Achieve Compliance         100         Image: Contract Deficiencies of the contract Deficiency Deficienc			_												40					CONSOLUT			_		
Correct Deficiencies         60         ■         ■         ■         Correct Deficiencies         60         □         Other         Other         Other         Other         Other         Other         Other         Other         40         Image: Correct Deficiencies         Other         August Transporter         August Transporter <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>-</td> <td></td> <td>CONSULIL</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>									-											CONSULIL					
Other 40				_	+ +			_	-				+				+								
					+ +			_	+=	+		_	+	++			1		+		** *** * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *		-		
COMP. WELLHEADSOURCE WATER PROTECT PLANS - TOTAL 100 (max) 100 (ma	COMP, WELLHEAD/SOURCE WATER PROTECT PLANS - TOTAL	100 (max)	_		_										-		100			COMP WE		100 (max)	$\vdash$	100 100	